UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/985,871	11/06/2001	Amy L. Sherwood	BS01-176	4479

28970   7590   11/17/2004

SHAW PITTMAN
IP GROUP
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD
SUITE 1300
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER
MAHMOUDI, HASSAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2165	

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/985,871	SHERWOOD, AMY L.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Tony Mahmoudi	2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this·communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 July 2004</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37

CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR

1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn

pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's Request for Continued Examination (RCE)

submission, including an amendment/response to the previous Office Action, filed on 26-

July-2004 has been entered.

Remarks

2. In response to communications filed on 26-July-2004, claims 1-5, 9, 13-15, 17, 21, 24-25,

and 31 have been amended per applicant's request. Claims 1-31 are presently pending in the

application.

Specification

3. The specification is objected to because the arrangement of the disclosed application does not

conform with 37 CFR 1.77(b).

Section heading appear **boldfaced** throughout the disclosed specification. Section

headings should not be **boldfaced**. Appropriate corrections are required according to the

guidelines provided below:

4. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility

application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

(a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.

(b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.

(c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.

(d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or

REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)

(e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.

(1) Field of the Invention.

(2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.

(f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.

(g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).

(h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.

(i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).

(j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).

(k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Claim Objections

5. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 14, lines 14 and 15, "the the current database" needs to be changed to --the

current database--. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in
> (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the
> invention by the applicant for patent or
> (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall
> have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the
> international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the
> English language.

7. Claims 1, 3-6, 13, and 17-18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Andrews et al (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0077998 A1.)

As to claim 1, Andrews et al teaches a method for maintaining a personnel directory (see

Abstract, and see paragraphs 79 and 155) comprising the steps of:

receiving a request to edit an existing data entry of the personnel directory, wherein the

existing data entry is stored in a current database location (see paragraphs 40 and 51-54);

in response to receiving the request to edit the existing data entry, copying the existing

data entry from the existing database location to create a previous data entry in a historical

database location (see paragraphs 102 and 108);

editing the existing data entry of the personnel directory stored in the current database

location (see paragraphs 51-54) to produce an associated data entry (see paragraphs 121-

122); and

associating the previous data entry stored in the historical database location with the

associated data entry (see paragraph 102.)

As to claim 3, Andrews et al teaches wherein the step of editing comprises changing the

existing data entry to a new data entry, and wherein the associated data entry includes the

new data entry (see paragraph 119.)

As to claim 4, Andrews et al teaches wherein the existing data entry includes a name of a

person listed in the personnel directory, and wherein the new data entry includes a new name

of the person (see figures 4 and 50, and see paragraphs 86 and 148-150.)

As to claim 5, Andrews et al teaches wherein the step of editing the existing data entry

comprises deleting the existing data entry, and wherein the associated data entry includes a

replacement data entry of the personnel directory (see page 47, claim 6.)

As to claims 6 and 18, Andrews et al teaches further comprising the step of prompting a

user to identify the replacement data entry (see figure 12, and see paragraphs 21 and 85.)

As to claim 13, the applicant is directed to the remarks and discussions made in claims 1-

6 above.

As to claim 17, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified teaches, wherein the personnel directory

application is adapted to copy a data entry of the current database location into the historical

database location (see paragraph102), to delete the data entry of the current database

location, and to associate the copied data entry of the historical database location with a

replacement data entry of the current database location (see page 47, claim 6.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

9.   Claims 2 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Andrews et</u>

<u>al</u> (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0077998 A1) in view of <u>Kodama</u> (U.S. Publication No.

2002/0045976 A1.)

As to claims 2 and 14, <u>Andrews et al</u> does not teach wherein historical database location

and the current database location are in separate databases.

Kodama teaches a remote maintenance system (see Abstract), in which he teaches

wherein historical database location and the current database location are in separate

databases (see figure 1, and see paragraphs 60 and 76.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have modified Andrews et al to include wherein historical

database location and the current database location are in separate databases.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Andrews et al by the teaching of Kodama, because

including wherein historical database location and the current database location are in

separate databases, would enable the system to run on remote and distributed databases,

where the historical (archived or backed-up) employee records are kept in a remote secure

area.

10. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews et al (U.S.

Publication No. 2002/0077998 A1) in view of Seestrom et al (U.S. Publication No.

2002/0147731 Al.)

As to claim 7, Andrews et al does not teach further comprising the step of identifying the

replacement data entry automatically using predefined rules.

Seestrom et al teaches a method of updating an addressee database in a mail sorting

apparatus (see Abstract), in which he teaches further comprising the step of identifying the

replacement data entry automatically using predefined rules (see paragraph 27, where

"predefined rules" is read on "signal is an "N" indicating a name change" and "replacement

data" is read on "new name".)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have modified Andrews et al to include the step of

identifying the replacement data entry automatically using predefined rules.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Andrews et al by the teaching of Seestrom et al,

because by including the step of using the "N" signal indicating a name change, would allow

the application to make the appropriate modification to the employee's record in the database.

11. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews et al (U.S.

Publication No. 2002/0077998 A1) in view of Okura (U.S. Patent No. 5,829,003.)

As to claim 8, Andrews et al does not teach wherein the existing data entry corresponds

to a departed person, and wherein the replacement data entry corresponds to a person who

has assumed responsibilities of the departed person.

Okura teaches a record processing apparatus (see Abstract), in which he teaches wherein

the existing data entry corresponds to a departed person and wherein the replacement data

envy corresponds to a person who has assumed responsibilities of the departed person (see

Fig. 3A and 3B and see column 10, lines 36-41, where "departed person" is read on "Kyoko

Yamamoto" and "replacement data entry" is read on "Hanako Suzuki".)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have modified Andrews et al to include the existing data

entry corresponds to a departed person, and wherein the replacement data entry corresponds

to a person who has assumed responsibilities of the departed person.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Andrews et al by the teaching of Okura because by

including the existing data entry corresponds to a departed person, and wherein the

replacement data entry corresponds to a person who has assumed responsibilities of the

departed person, would identified a new service superior in the organizational chart.

12. Claims 9-12, 15-16, 19-23, 25-26, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. t 03(a) as being

unpatentable over Andrews et al (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0077998 A1) in view of Pisello

et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,495,607.)

As to claim 9, Andrews et al does not teach further comprising the steps of:

receiving a search query looking for the previous data entry;

searching the current database for the previous data entry;

searching the historical database for the previous data entry;

identifying the associated data entry as corresponding to the previous data entry; and

reporting the previous data entry and the associated data entry.

Pisello et al teaches a network management system (see Abstract), in which he teaches

further comprising the steps of receiving a search query looking for the previous data entry

searching the current database for the previous data entry (see column 16, lines 51-59, where

"search query" is read on "SQL", "previous data entry" is read on "version number", and

"current database" is read on "primary storage"); searching the historical database for the

previous data entry (see column 29, lines 41-46, where "previous data entry" is read on "files and chronological file attributes"); identifying the associated data entry as corresponding to the previous data entry; and reporting the previous data entry and the associated data entry (see column 14, table 2, where "associated data entry" is read on "the line containing entry "931004 09:15" and "previous data entry" is read on "the line containing entry "931003 17:35".)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Andrews et al to include the receiving a search query looking for the previous data entry; searching the current database for the previous data entry; searching the historical database for the previous data entry; identifying the associated data entry as corresponding to the previous data entry; and reporting the previous data entry and the associated data entry.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Andrews et al by the teaching of Pisello et al because by including the following activities of receiving a search query looking for the previous data entry; searching the current database for the previous data entry; searching the historical database for the previous data entry; identifying the associated data entry as corresponding to the previous data entry; and reporting the previous data entry and the associated data entry, would allow the System administrator to locate the previous entry and the associated data entry from either the current or the historical database.

As to claims 10, 22, and 26, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, teaches further comprising the step of reporting how the previous data entry and the associated data entry are associated (see <u>Pisello et al</u>, column 14, table 2, where "previous data entry" is read on "931004 09:15", "associated data entry" is read on "931003 17:35", "associated" is read on "dave.doc", and both entries have "dave.doc" as the file name.)

As to claim 11, <u>Andres et al</u> as modified, teaches further comprising the step of reporting why the previous data entry was superseded (see <u>Pisello et al</u>, column 14, table 2, where "previous data entry" is read "the line containing entry "931003 17:35"" and the reason the previous data entry is superseded because the revision date is earlier.)

As to claim 12, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, still does not teach wherein the step of receiving a search query comprises at least one of receiving the search query in a search engine of the personnel directory and receiving the search query as a request to browse a list of data entries from at least one of the current database and the historical database.

<u>Pisello et al</u> teaches wherein the step of receiving a search query comprises at least one of receiving the search query in a search engine of the personnel directory and receiving the search query as a request to browse a list of data entries from at least one of the current database and the historical database (see column 14, lines 16-19, see column 13, lines 5-10, where "current database" is read on "relational database", and see Table 21.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, to include the

step of receiving a search query comprises at least one of receiving the search query in a

search engine of the personnel directory and receiving the search query as a request to

browse a list of data entries from at least one of the current database and the historical

database.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to have modified Andrews et al as modified, by the teaching of Pisello et

al because by including the step of receiving; a search query comprises at least one of

receiving the search query in a search engine of the personnel directory and receiving the

search query as a request to browse a list of data entries from at least one of the current

database and the historical database, would allow the System administrator to look at the

results of the search query.

As to claim 15, Andrews et al does not teach wherein the personnel directory application

is adapted to search the current database location for the copied data entry, to search the

historical database location for the copied data entry.

Pisello et al teaches wherein the personnel directory application is adapted to search the

current database location for the copied data entry (see column 16, lines 51-59, where

"copied data entry" is read on "version number" and "current database" is read on "primary

storage"), to search the historical database location for the copied data entry (see column 29,

lines 41-46, where "copied data entry" is read on "chronological file attributes".)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention was made to have modified Andrews et al to include the personnel

directory application is adapted to search the current database location for the copied data

entry, to search the historical database location for the copied data entry.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to have modified Andrews et al by the teaching of Pisello et al because

by including the personnel directory application is adapted to search the current database

location for the copied data entry, to search the historical database location for the copied

data entry, would allow the System administrator to locate the copied data entry from either

the current or the historical database.

As to claim 16, Andrews et al as modified, teaches wherein the personnel directory

application is adapted to provide an explanation of the association between the copied data

entry and the edited data entry (see Pisello et al, column 16, lines 51-59, and see column 29,

lines 41-46.)

As to claim 19, Andrews et al teaches a personnel directory application (see Abstract, and

see paragraphs 79 and 155) comprising:

(a) a first database interface through which the personnel directory application is adapted

to store current data entries in a current database (see paragraphs 27-30);

(b) a second database interface through which the personnel directory application is

adapted to store outdated data entries in a historical database (see paragraph 31);

(c) a graphical user interface (see paragraph 77) that accepts a search query for a desired

outdated data entry (see paragraph 109.)

For the remaining steps of this claim, the applicant is directed to the remarks and

discussions made in claims 1-6 and 9-12 above.

As to claim 20, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified teaches wherein the current database and the

historical database are a single database (see <u>Andrews et al</u>, figure 1, database 20.)

As to claim 21, <u>Andrews et al</u> teaches a method for maintaining a personnel directory of

an organization comprising the steps of: copying an existing data entry at a current database

location maintaining a plurality of data entries of the personnel directory into a copied data

entry at a historical database location; editing the existing data entry to create a new data

entry in the current database location; associating the new data entry at the current database

location with the copied data entry at the historical database location (applicant is directed to

the remarks and discussions made in claims 1 and 19 above.)

<u>Andrews et al</u> does not teach:

receiving a search query for the copied data entry at the historical database location; and

reporting the copied data entry and the associated new data entry from the historical

database location, and the associated new data entry from the current database location.

<u>Pisello et al</u> teaches :

receiving a search query for the copied data entry at the historical database location; (see

column 15, lines 24-40, where "search query for copied data entry" is read on "searchable

database field of File Chronology');

reporting the copied data entry from the historical database location and the associated new data entry from the current database location (see column 14, table 2, where "copied data entry" is read on "the line containing entry "931003 17:35" and "new data entry" is read on "the line containing entry "931004 09:15".)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Andrews et al to include receiving a search query for the copied data entry; and reporting the copied data entry and the associated new data entry.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Andrews et al by the teaching of Pisello et al because by including receiving a search query for the copied data entry; and reporting the copied data entry and the associated new data entry, would allow the user to easily search and view the copied data entry and the associated new data entry.

As to claim 23, Andrews et al as modified teaches wherein the existing data entry includes a name of a member in the organization, and wherein the step of editing comprises changing the name of the member (see Andrews et al, figures 4 and 50, and see paragraphs 86 and 148-150.)

As to claim 25, the applicant is directed to the remarks and discussions made in claims 1, 9, and 21 above.

As to claim 30, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified teaches wherein the step of determining

comprises prompting a user to specify the replacement data entry (see <u>Andrews et al</u>, (see

figure 12, and see paragraphs 21 and 85.)

13. Claims 24 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Andrews et</u>

<u>al</u> (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0077998 A1) in view of <u>Pisello et al</u> (U.S. Patent No.

5,495,607), as applied to claims 9-12, 15-16, 19-23, 25-26, and 30 above, and further in view

of <u>Kodama</u> (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0045976 A1.)

As to claims 24 and 31, <u>Andrews et al</u> does not teach wherein the current database

location and the historical database location are in separate databases.

<u>Kodama</u> teaches a remote maintenance system (see Abstract), in which he teaches

wherein historical database location and the current database location are in separate

databases (see figure 1, and see paragraphs 60 and 76.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have modified <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, to include wherein

historical database location and the current database location are in separate databases.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, by the teaching of <u>Kodama</u>,

because including wherein historical database location and the current database location are

in separate databases, would enable the system to run on remote and distributed databases,

where the historical (archived or backed-up) employee records are kept in a remote secure

area.

14. Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Andrews et al</u>

(U.S. Publication No. 2002/0077998 A1) in view of <u>Pisello et al</u> (U.S. Patent No. 5,495,607),

as applied to claims 9-12, 15-16, 19-23, 25-26, and 30 above, and still further in view of

<u>Okura</u> (U.S. Patent No. 5,829,003).

As to claim 27, <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, still does not teach wherein the existing data

entry includes information related to a member who is departing the organization, and

wherein the replacement data entry includes information related to a replacement member of

the organization who substitutes for the departing member.

<u>Okura</u> teaches wherein the existing data entry includes information related to a member

who is departing the organization (see Fig. 3A and 3B; see column 9, lines 44-47, where

"existing data entry" is read on "employee record 54r-5","member who is departing the

organization" is read on "Kyoko Yamamoto"), and wherein the replacement data entry

includes information related to a replacement member of the organization who substitutes for

the departing member (see column 10, lines 36-41, where "replacement data entry" is read on

"employee record 54r--5", "replacement member" is read on "Hanako Suzuki".)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention was made to have modified <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, to include the

existing data entry includes information related to a member who is departing the

organization, and wherein the replacement data entry includes information related to a

replacement member of the organization who substitutes for the departing member.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Andrews et al as modified, by the teaching of Okura because by including the existing data entry includes information related to a member who is departing the organization, and wherein the replacement data entry includes information related to a replacement member of the organization who substitutes for the departing member, would allow the correct reassignment of the departing member organizational position.

As to claim 28, Andrews et al as modified, still does not teach wherein the step of determining comprises determining an organizational position of the departing member from the existing data entry, locating a second existing data entry with the organizational position, and making the second existing data entry the replacement data entry.

Okura teaches wherein the step of determining comprises determining an organizational position of the departing member from the existing data entry (see Fig. 3A and 3B; see column 9, lines 44-47, where "organizational position" is read on "superior member", "departing member" is read on "Kyoko Yamamoto"), locating; a second existing data entry with the organizational position, and making the second existing data entry the replacement data entry (see column 10, lines 36-41, where "organizational position" is read on "service superior" and "replacement data entry" is read on "Hanako Suzuki".)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Andrews et al as modified, to include the step of determining comprises determining an organizational position of the departing

member from the existing data entry, locating a second existing data entry with the organizational position, and making the second existing data entry the replacement data entry.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Andrews et al as modified, by the teaching of Okura because by including the step of determining comprises determining an organizational position of the departing member from the existing data entry, locating a second existing data entry with the organizational position, and making the second existing data entry the replacement data entry, would allow the re-assignment of the departing member's organizational position to the appropriate personnel in the organization.

As to claim 29, Andrews et al as modified, still does not teach wherein the step of determining comprises determining a supervisor of the departing member from the existing data entry, locating a second existing data entry corresponding to the supervisor, and making the second existing data entry the replacement data entry.

Okura teaches, wherein the step of determining comprises determining a supervisor of the departing member from the existing data entry, (see Fig. 3A and 3B, see column 9, lines 38-41, where "supervisor" is read on "service superior", "departing member" is read on "Kyoko Yamamoto", and "existing data entry" is read on "employee record 54r-4"), locating a second existing data entry corresponding to the supervisor, and making the second existing data entry the replacement data entry (see column 10, lines 36-41, where "replacement data entry" is read on "Hanako Suzuki".)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, the step of determining comprises determining a supervisor of the departing member from the existing data entry, locating a second existing data entry corresponding to the supervisor, and making the second existing data entry the replacement data entry.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified <u>Andrews et al</u> as modified, by the teaching of <u>Okura</u> because by including the step of determining comprises determining a supervisor of the departing member from the existing data entry, locating a second existing data entry corresponding to the supervisor, and making the second existing data entry the replacement data entry, would allow the supervisor of the departing member to assume the departing member's organizational position.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed on 26-July-2004 with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds for rejection.

Conclusion

16. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony Mahmoudi whose telephone number is (571) 272-4078. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 08:00 am to 04:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at (571) 272-4083.

tm

November 4, 2004

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER